



USAID Quarterly Report

SUPPORT FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS IN PERU THROUGH INTERNATIONAL MONITORING OF THE 2001 ELECTION PROCESS

**USAID Grant No. 527-G-00-01-00058-00
July 1 to September 30, 2001**

I. SUMMARY

After a protracted political crisis and tense electoral period in Peru, the 2001 elections represented a significant step towards returning Peru to the world community of democracies. To complete their international observation effort of this extraordinary electoral process, the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) and The Carter Center organized a post-election evaluation assessment mission to Peru during the second week of July. The post-election mission consisted of a series of meetings with key players involved in the electoral process and a public presentation of NDI/Carter Center's interim report on the 2001 elections, highlighting recommendations for future democratic reforms in Peru. NDI/Carter Center also partnered with the Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) and *Transparencia*, a Peruvian election monitoring organization, to conduct a three-day conference on "*Democratization of the State*" from July 11 to 13. The conference provided a forum for public dialogue on democratic reforms in the areas of Civil Society and Public Opinion"; "Parties: Representation and Party Systems"; "The Role of the Armed Forces and the National Defense System"; and "Electoral Reform".

Through consultations with USAID, NDI/Carter Center was granted a no-cost extension of its election monitoring project through December 31, 2001, to conduct follow-on activities related to the recommendations made by the two institutes in the area of electoral reform. In collaboration with *Transparencia* and *International IDEA*, NDI and the Carter Center are organizing a series of roundtable discussions with civic and political leaders in regional capitals throughout Peru to discuss recommendations for electoral reform.

During this reporting period, NDI/Carter Center worked closely with its partner organizations to prepare the methodology and materials for these seminars, and the first roundtable discussion was held September 22 in Huánuco. At a final international seminar scheduled to take place in Lima on November 30, the organizing institutes will present the conclusions and recommendations generated by this seminar series to members of the Peruvian Congress and to national electoral authorities.

II. BACKGROUND

After a decade of centralized government and the steady eroding of democratic institutions in Peru under then-President Alberto Fujimori, the transitional government under President Valentin Paniagua quickly recognized that it was critical for the 2001 elections to rebuild public confidence in the political process. Both the President and his Cabinet made a clear public commitment, through official directives, to ensuring the impartiality of government authorities throughout the election process. On April 9 and in the run-off election on June 3, the Peruvian people sent a clear message of their desire and determination to establish a government based on a democratic electoral mandate. Hundreds of thousands of Peruvians helped to ensure the integrity of the elections by participating as election officials, political party poll-watchers and nonpartisan election monitors throughout the election process, organizing peaceful and effective voting and continuing processes.

After winning the election, Alejandro Toledo, Peru's first president of indigenous origin was inaugurated in Lima on July 28. A more symbolic inaugural ceremony was held in the Andean capital of Cuzco the following day. Having secured Congressional approval for his first economic reactivation package and high public approval ratings in the first two months of his term, there were high hopes for increased economic and political stability under President Toledo's administration.

Nonetheless, the current administration faces many challenges that will affect its ability to govern. The new government must restore democratic institutions that were intentionally undermined and corrupted by the Fujimori government. In the Congress that assumed its five-year mandate on July 28, 2001, no political group holds a majority. Meanwhile, Congress will play a crucial role in implementing necessary constitutional, judicial and legislative reforms, and ample public dialogue on these reforms is key to ensuring their sustainability. With this in mind, NDI/Carter Center co-organized a conference in Lima in July with *Transparencia* and *International IDEA* to contribute to a national dialogue on a number of recommended reforms by sharing international comparative experiences in these areas.

In conjunction with these activities, NDI/Carter Center held consultations with USAID Democracy Program staff regarding future complementary activities that would address the objectives of this joint election-monitoring program. Based on these consultations on the findings of the post-election assessment mission and on the conclusions of the Democratization Conference, NDI/Carter Center requested an additional no-cost extension of this grant through December 31, 2001, to follow up on recommendations for future democratic reforms. Specifically, the two institutes proposed to organize a series of round table discussions with elected officials and civil society leaders to evaluate and make recommendations for reforms to Peru's electoral system. USAID granted that extension request.

The first several months of the new administration represent a critical juncture in the Peruvian transition and a unique opportunity to help shape the future of democratization efforts in the country. By addressing the recommendations made by the joint NDI/Carter Center election observation mission in Peru, the post-election activities of the joint observation mission

aim to contribute to the democratization process, while complementing the institutes election-monitoring activities of the past 18 months.

III. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Post-Election Assessment Mission: July 9 to 11, 2001

Rodrigo Carazo, Former President of Costa Rica, led the NDI/Carter Center post-election observation delegation, which visited Peru from July 9 through July 13. The delegation met with a wide range of Peruvian leaders, including Fernando Tuesta Soldevilla, Head of the National Office for Electoral Processes (*ONPE*); Manuel Sánchez-Palacios Paiva, President of the National Elections Tribunal (*JNE*); Jorge del Castillo, Secretary General of the *Partido Aprista Peruano* – (*APRA*); Diego García Sayán, Justice Minister; Luis Solari, Secretary General of *Peru Posible*; and Walter Albán, acting *Defensor del Pueblo* (Ombudsman).

The NDI/Carter Center post-election delegation released a public report on the 2001 elections at the opening of the joint conference on the democratization of the Peruvian state.¹ The delegation expressed satisfaction with the overall results of the electoral process and with Peru's extraordinary accomplishments in implementing them; The peaceful and well-administered elections were a dramatic contrast to the fraudulent and illegitimate process of 2000. The delegation also commended the remarkable resolve demonstrated by Peruvian citizens throughout a protracted political crisis in their country, the leadership of the transitional government under President Valentin Paniagua and Prime Minister Javier Perez de Cuellar, the Congress, the electoral authorities, and the role of civic organizations such as *Transparencia* in raising confidence in this year's elections.

The interim report outlined long-term recommendations in four areas: (1) Electoral and Governmental Systems, (2) Election Administration and Election Procedures, (3) Mass Communications Media, and (4) Ensuring Integrity of Public Institutions:

- That broad political dialogue be held before making major changes to electoral systems and governance institutions, such as proportional representation versus single-member districts, unicameral versus bicameral legislature, and decentralization of national government authority.
- That Congress enact legislation to help strengthen political parties, which are among the weakest of the democratic institutions in Peru. Such legislation should establish requirements for internal party democracy, financial accountability, and promotion of women and youth in political processes.
- That public interest should be protected by laws and regulations to limit the corrupting influence of money in politics. Authorities should consider partial public funding for political parties and electoral campaigns, more stringent disclosure requirements for campaign finance, and restrictions on paid political advertisements to reduce the need to raise large amounts of money for electoral campaigns.

¹ The Interim Report on the 2001 Elections is attached as Annex 1.

- That Peruvians consider streamlining the election authorities and clarifying institutional roles to reduce duplication and other inefficiencies. Study of other election administration bodies could help provide ideas for the most appropriate structure, taking into account Peruvian political culture and experience.
- That state-controlled media be required to provide politically impartial news coverage, and Peruvian electoral authorities should expand free air time privileges (*franja electoral*) for candidates to local news media during election campaigns.
- That Congress legislate statutory controls to guarantee transparency, access to information, and accountability in all government programs and agencies, including the armed forces and intelligence services.

The delegation concluded that broad consensus-building leads to more sustainable political solutions than do high-level, closed negotiations and recommended that the high level of collaboration and consultation established for the 2001 elections continue in the months and years ahead.

Conference on Democratization in Peru: July 11 - 13, 2001

From July 11 to 13, NDI/The Carter Center, *International IDEA* and *Transparencia* collaborated in the organization of a seminar on “Democratization of the State” that was held at the *Pontificia Universidad Catolica* in Lima and was open to the general public. Peruvian expert panelists included Salomon Lerner, Director of the *Universidad Catolica* and President of the Truth Commission; Rafael Roncagliolo, Secretary General of *Transparencia*; Enrique Obando, President of the Institute for Strategic and Political Studies; Susana Villarán, Minister for the Promotion of Women; and Sofia Macher, National Coordinator for Human Rights among. Elected Vice President Raul Diez Canseco gave the closing address. International panelists include: Genaro A. Herrera, Director of the State Bank of Chile; Former General Joaquin Cuadra, President of the National Unity Party of Nicaragua; Jose Woldenberg, President of the Federal Electoral Institute of Mexico (IFE); Luis Moreno Ocampo, President of *Poder Ciudadano* from Argentina; Rodrigo Carazo, Former President of Costa Rica; and representatives from all four of the organizing institutes.²

The seminar focused on the need for continuing reforms to ensure a more democratic and sustainable government. The seminar commenced with welcoming remarks from representatives of the four institutes and a brief summary by invited guests of Peru’s role in the development of democracy in Latin America. Four additional sessions followed: Civil Society and Public Opinion; Parties: Representation and Party Systems; The Role of the Armed Forces and the National Defense System; and Electoral Reform. NDI’s Regional Director for Latin America and the Caribbean, Gerardo Le Chevallier, and the Director of the Democracy Program at The Carter Center, Charles Costello, served as moderators during the seminar. The conference ended with a final session to present conclusions and concrete recommendations. A full transcript of the conference sessions and a complete list of recommendations were included in the post-conference publication entitled “Democratization of the State: The Pending Challenge.”

² The agenda for the Democratization Conference is attached as Annex 2.

Electoral Reform Seminars: Roundtable in Huánuco, September 22, 2001

On September 22, NDI/The Carter Center, *International IDEA* and *Transparencia* held the first in a series of four regional workshops designed to generate dialogue and solicit public input on recommended reforms to Peru's electoral system. Over 40 people of distinct backgrounds including university professors', representatives of civic organizations, political parties and movements; regional and local elected officials, and one Congressman from Huánuco attended the event.² Three weeks prior to the workshop, the organizing institutes sent out invitations and provided briefing materials to confirmed participants: "terms of reference", background articles on electoral systems, reforms, and comparative perspective, and a summary of the current electoral reform proposals for Peru. Many of the participants commented that the guide helped them to prepare for the workshop.

Marcelo Varela from International IDEA presented the objectives and methods of electoral reform in Latin America, which helped put the Peruvian case in a regional context. Participants were divided into two groups and were asked to discuss: the composition and structure of the Congress (i.e., number of representatives, requirements to be a candidate, number of chambers, and functions of the chambers); and electoral districts: (i.e. number and size of districts, type (uni/plurinominal), types of voter lists (regional or national), and party primaries.³)

The groups were then asked to exchange topics, and during the afternoon a special session was held to discuss the conclusions reached by each group for each topic. Shortly after this closed discussion, a public forum was held where the following recommendations from the workshop were made:

1. A political party law or statute should be established before considering electoral reforms, as many of the changes must come from within the parties themselves.
2. The decentralization process now underway (with election of regional presidents scheduled for next year) will affect and condition the electoral reform process.
3. Steps should be taken to ensure that Members of Congress are more responsive to departmental issues and concerns.
4. Most participants recommended reestablishing a bicameral legislature, but maintaining the same number of representatives.

² A complete list of participants at the Huánuco seminar is attached as Annex 3.

³ The agenda of the Huánuco seminar is attached as Annex 4.

IV. RESULTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Post-Election Monitoring Activities

Under the provisions of the first no-cost extension request submitted to USAID, NDI and The Carter Center established the following objectives for the immediate post-election period (July – August 2001):

- *To assess the entire electoral process and outline recommendations for future political reforms based on the experience of the 2000 and 2001 elections;*
- *To help promote public dialogue on the ongoing need for democratic reforms by creating a forum for political debate between various sectors;*
- *To recommend future activities to help strengthen democracy in Peru.*

Progress toward achieving these results is summarized below.

1. To assess the entire electoral process and outline recommendations for future political reforms based on the experience of the 2000 and 2001 elections.

A four-member NDI/Carter Center delegation traveled to Peru in July to assess the entire electoral process and made a series of recommendations in a public report released on July 11. The two institutes prepared the summary report as a means of contributing to a national dialogue on a number of specific recommended reforms by sharing international comparative experiences in these areas. Approximately 75 representatives of the media, civic groups, the election authorities and the government attended the public presentation of the report, including the President of the *Jurado Nacional de Elecciones* (JNE) and the head of the *Oficina Nacional de Procesos Electorales* (ONPE). Copies of the full report were distributed to the public, and the delegations' recommendations were covered in major newspapers the following day, thus disseminating the information to a wider audience.

2. To help promote public dialogue on democratic reforms by creating a forum for debate between various sectors on proposed reforms.

As part of their post-election mission, NDI and The Carter Center helped organize a three-day seminar focused on the need for continuous reform to ensure a more democratic and sustainable government. The forum attracted high-level panelists and guests, and participants had the opportunity to address questions to the international panelists regarding the experiences of other countries in implementing some of the reforms that Peru is considering. In this manner the event helped encourage a broader dialogue on proposed democratic reforms. However, the organizing institutes concluded that, for future activities of this nature, it would be more effective to limit the audience to decision-makers and a small group of citizens interested in advocating a particular issue or reform in order to increase the level of contact between the two groups.

3. To recommend future activities to help strengthen democracy in Peru.

NDI and The Carter Center presented a request for a no-cost extension of the election-monitoring project to conduct a series of roundtable discussions on the topic of electoral reform.

Promoting Dialogue on Electoral Reform

This series of seminars on electoral reform are is guided by three objectives:

- To promote awareness and dialogue at the local level on the issue of electoral reform;
- To encourage linkages between local civic groups and the elected officials who represent them at the national level; and
- To facilitate the input of citizens on recommended electoral reforms by establishing a mechanism to communicate recommendations from around the country to the national legislature.

Although the seminar series began near the end of this reporting period, the first seminar held in Huánuco has already yielded positive results. Briefing materials sent to participants prior to the workshop promoted a better understanding of the current electoral system and recommended reforms so that invited guests were able to participate effectively in the discussion on September 22. Several interviews with NDI/Carter Center representatives in Peru, were broadcast on local radio and television stations, explaining the objectives of the workshop and contributing to increased public awareness of the national debate on electoral reforms. There was also press coverage during the workshop itself, particularly of the final session where workshop participants presented their conclusions.

The methodology implemented helped promote linkages between citizens and their elected officials, as representatives of 12 local NGOs participated in a substantive discussion with one member of Congress from Huánuco, two local officials from Huánuco and a local coordinator of the ONPE. Five local political party leaders participated, representing *Peru Posible*, *Unidad Nacional*, *APRA* and *Acción Popular*. The recently formed “Commission of Huanucan Opinion” helped organize the event and identify participants. This group was created with the support of a member of Congress from Huánuco with the express purpose of helping to communicate citizen concerns to elected officials at the national level.

Following the seminar in Huánuco, NDI/Carter Center field staff in Lima sent a brief summary of the workshop conclusions to each of the members of Congress who represent Huánuco, as well as to the Constitutional Commission in Congress that is responsible for electoral reform issues. In this manner, the event helped meet the stated objective of establishing a mechanism to communicate citizen input to national representatives in Congress.

V. FUTURE ACTIVITIES

As follow-up activities to the 2001 election observation program, NDI/Carter Center will continue to work with International IDEA and *Transparencia* in carrying out additional round table discussions on the topic of electoral reform during the next reporting period:

- October 3 – Lima: **Roundtable #1**

- October 6 – Iquitos: **Electoral Organization and Structure of Congress** (i.e. structure of the election authorities, number of polling stations per voting center, requirements for party and candidate registration, number of representatives in Congress, and bicameral versus unicameral system.)
- October 18 – Lima: **Roundtable #2**
- October 20 – Trujillo: **Electoral Organization and Structure of Congress**
- November 8 – Lima: **Roundtable #3**
- November 10 – Arequipa: **Electoral Organization and Structure of Congress**
- November 30 - December 1 – Lima: **International Seminar**

Recommendations and conclusions reached at the regional seminars will be presented at the roundtable discussions in Lima, along with a discussion of topics pertaining to the national debate on the issue of state reform. Leaders of the *ONPE* and *JNE*, academics, members of Congress and experts in electoral reform from Peru and abroad, will be invited to attend the roundtable discussions in Lima, which will be held at the offices of *Transparencia*. The final event in Lima will be organized in close collaboration with the relevant committees in the Peruvian Congress to target decision-makers who will be debating these reform issues at the national level. The International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) will also collaborate in the organization of this event by sponsoring the participation of several international experts on electoral reform and helping to cover the costs of a final publication on the event.

ANNEX 1



PERU ELECTIONS 2001

Interim Report of the

**National Democratic Institute/Carter Center
Joint Election Monitoring Project**

LIMA, July 11, 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The National Democratic Institute (NDI) and The Carter Center would like to thank first and foremost the Peruvian people for the warm welcome that they have given each and every one of our ten election observation delegations and to our field representatives resident in Lima almost continuously over the past year and a half. The citizens of Peru have demonstrated remarkable resolve throughout a protracted political crisis in their country, coming together to ensure a peaceful transition of power through an extraordinary, democratic election process.

In particular, NDI and The Carter Center would like to thank the many individuals who met with our delegations and field representatives on various occasions; they were always ready to share information, concerns and, in many cases, friendship. Members of the January, March, April and June delegations were grateful for the generous donation of time and essential contribution of expertise offered by: the President of the Republic Valentin Paniagua; President of the Council of Ministers and Foreign Minister Javier Perez de Cuellar; Minister of Justice, Diego Garcia Sayan; Minister of Defense, Walter Ledesma; Minister of Women and Human Development, Susana Villaran; the heads and personnel of the JNE, ONPE and RENIEC; leaders of the Congress; the presidential candidates and leaders of their political groups; the acting *Defensor del Pueblo*, Walter Alban, and other representatives of the *Defensoria del Pueblo* throughout the country; leaders of *Transparencia*, as well as many dedicated *Transparencia* staff and volunteers nationwide; leaders of *Consejo por la Paz*; representatives of polling firms and the Peruvian media; Eduardo Stein and members of the Organization of American States Observation Mission; Eva Zetterberg and representatives of the European Union observer delegation; and representatives of the technical assistance missions of the United Nations, IFES, and CAPEL. Many of these individuals also participated as panelists in briefing sessions for our international observer delegations for both rounds of the election, and we are extremely grateful for their collaboration. In addition, ambassadors of the United States, Canada, member countries of the European Union and of Andean countries provided invaluable encouragement and support for our activities.

Finally, NDI and The Carter Center would like to express our sincere appreciation for the critical contribution of the more than 50 volunteer observers who participated in our two international election observation delegations for the April 8 and June 3 elections. In particular, we would like to recognize the outstanding leadership of these two delegations. The first round observer delegation was led by Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States; Ramiro de Leon Carpio, former President of Guatemala and current Vice President of Guatemala's Legislative Assembly; Eni Faleomavaega, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives; and Peter McPherson, President of Michigan State University and former Administrator of USAID under the Reagan Administration. The second round delegation was led by Madeleine K. Albright, Chairman of NDI and former Secretary of State of the United States; Ramiro de Leon Carpio, former President of Guatemala and current Vice President of Guatemala's Legislative Assembly; Rodrigo Carazo Odio, former President of Costa Rica; and Sam Gejdenson, former ranking Member of the U.S. House of Representatives International Relations Committee. NDI

and The Carter Center rely on the experience and generosity of individuals such as these to fulfill our responsibilities as international election observers.

The NDI/Carter Center observation mission in Peru was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and we are particularly grateful for the consistent support and invaluable encouragement of the staff of the USAID mission in Peru throughout this project.

SUMMARY

Peru's 2001 elections represented an extraordinary accomplishment in the process of returning Peru to the world community of democracies. Hundreds of thousands of Peruvians helped to ensure the integrity of the election process, sending a clear message of their desire and determination to establish a government based on a democratic electoral mandate. The pre-election conditions met international standards for democratic elections, and elections on both April 8 and June 3 were well administered and peaceful. These accomplishments stand out dramatically when contrasted to the fraudulent and illegitimate process of last year, which was among the worst ever observed in this hemisphere by the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) and The Carter Center.

The government of President Valentin Paniagua, the election authorities, the candidates for President and Congress, their political parties and, most of all, the people of Peru deserve praise for their tremendous and continuing efforts in advancing Peru's democratic transition. Now, as in all countries moving to consolidate democracy, hard work lies ahead. In Peru, the principal focus must be on the re-institutionalization of institutions and processes requisite for political, economic and social development. This priority is all the more important in light of Alberto Fujimori's sustained efforts to undermine democratic foundations.

We commend the efforts by President Paniagua, Prime Minister Javier Perez de Cuellar and Peruvian civil society organizations such as *Transparencia* to initiate a national dialogue about political and constitutional reform. President-elect Alejandro Toledo and other political leaders have made constructive statements about such efforts and have taken a tolerant and cooperative approach to each other in the immediate post election period. Political parties agree that reform efforts should be at the top of the agenda for the new Congress, which will take office along with the new president on July 28.

NDI and The Carter Center will continue to monitor developments through the installation of the new government and will issue a detailed final report on the work of the observation mission. This interim report is offered in the hope of contributing to ongoing dialogue about needed reforms. A series of recommendations is presented in this report addressing: 1) electoral and governmental systems and political processes; 2) election administration and election procedures; 3) mass communications media; and 4) ensuring integrity of public institutions.

OVERVIEW OF THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

Over the course of the last year, the people of Peru accomplished one of the most dramatic and positive transformations of a country's election and political processes ever witnessed by NDI and The Carter Center. Peru's 2001 elections marked a sharp contrast with last year's process, which was fraudulently manipulated in favor of then President and candidate Alberto Fujimori. When the first NDI/Carter Center pre-election assessment mission arrived in Peru in November 1999, the vast web of corruption created by Fujimori and his former security

advisor Vladimiro Montesinos had penetrated all sectors of the Peruvian government, including the electoral authorities, the court system, public assistance programs and the Congress. The level of institutional manipulation of the electoral process prevented the basic conditions for a transparent election from being established. The evident lack of legitimacy of the 2000 elections, along with ongoing protests by citizen groups and political organizations in Peru, led to growing pressures on President Fujimori as he assumed what was likely an unconstitutional third term of office last July.

President Fujimori's lack of a clear, democratic mandate contributed to his government's quick collapse under the weight of scandals related to the criminal activities of Vladimiro Montesinos and others. When President Fujimori announced on September 16 his intention to leave the Presidency within one year, the OAS-brokered *mesa de dialogo* led to actions by the Peruvian Congress to amend the Constitution and put the necessary procedures in place to hold an extraordinary electoral process in 2001. The opposition then gained leadership of Congress and voted to remove Fujimori from office on grounds of moral incapacity. As a result, the newly elected President of Congress, Valentín Paniagua, became President of the Republic.

The transitional government of President Paniagua essentially faced two parallel challenges upon assuming office in November. The first was to organize a genuine, democratic election process to inaugurate a new President and Congress by July 28, 2001. The second was to investigate and bring to justice the numerous individuals implicated in the network of corruption associated with Montesinos and the Fujimori administration.

Although the election process had a clear deadline, it was soon evident that it would take many months, if not years, to conclude the corruption investigations. Prior to Fujimori's departure, a stockpile of more than 1,200 videotapes was recovered from one of the residences of Montesinos. Over the past eight months, videos showing influential Peruvians conspiring in the overt manipulation of the political process have been released to Congress and shown on national television. The ongoing investigation of numerous public officials, many of whom were affiliated with political groups participating in the election process, resulted in an unusually turbulent campaign environment and a climate of public skepticism.

After a decade of authoritarian government and the steady eroding of democratic institutions in Peru, the new government quickly recognized that it was critical for the 2001 elections to rebuild public confidence in the political process. In this sense, these extra-constitutional elections required extraordinary efforts to establish a solid foundation for Peru's democratic future. Immediately upon taking office, President Paniagua and his new Ministers began taking decisive steps to guarantee the neutrality of state institutions, local officials, the armed forces and the forces of public order in this election process. High-level personnel were replaced throughout a wide variety of state institutions, including the military, municipal government, public assistance programs and, of course, the election authorities. Both the President and his Cabinet made a clear public commitment, through official directives, to ensure the impartiality of government authorities throughout the process.

In addition, the government welcomed the presence of international election observer groups to help ensure the legitimacy and transparency of the 2001 elections. At the request of

Peruvian civic and political leaders, and with an invitation from the Peruvian government and electoral authorities, NDI and The Carter Center agreed to continue their ongoing monitoring of Peru's election and political processes and organize a joint comprehensive international electoral observation effort for the electoral process of 2001. As was the case of the 2000 NDI/Carter Center election observation mission in Peru, this long-term election monitoring program began with a comprehensive assessment of the pre-election context. The two institutes opened a permanent office in Lima in January 2001 to provide in-country monitoring of electoral developments and organized two high-level, international pre-election assessment delegations. These delegations traveled to Peru in January (January 18-26) and March (March 5-9) and held extensive meetings in Lima with a wide range of Peruvian leaders in order to obtain a broad perspective on the electoral environment.

NDI and The Carter Center noted in public pre-election reports that the reconstituted election authorities faced tremendous political and logistical challenges from the outset of the election process, due to the compressed timeframe of the elections and extremely low levels of public confidence in the electoral system. Given the fraudulent nature of last year's process, both the National Election Tribunal (JNE) and the National Office of Electoral Processes (ONPE)⁴ were forced to reorganize completely and hire many new personnel. In the case of the ONPE, more than 75 percent of its former employees were replaced with less than four months to go before the April 8 elections.

Other specific challenges faced by the election authorities included the recent establishment of a new electoral system based on multiple electoral districts; the need to select and train thousands of poll workers throughout the country to staff nearly 90,000 polling stations on election day; training public officials and informing citizens about the principles of state neutrality during the electoral process; and designing a new software program to tabulate votes on election day. Electoral officials demonstrated exceptional commitment and worked inordinately long hours to ensure that the logistical challenges of administering this election process were met and to restore confidence in the electoral system.

The pre-election periods leading to the April 8 elections and the June 3 presidential run-off were characterized by governmental respect for civil and political rights necessary for democratic elections. There were no problems in candidates qualifying for the ballot. Candidates and their supporters were free to campaign throughout the country. State institutions, including those responsible for food distribution, tax investigations, the armed forces and police, acted in a politically neutral manner, as required by the constitution. There was a dramatic improvement in the press coverage of the election campaign in comparison to the widespread manipulation of the news media in favor of President-candidate Fujimori during last year's campaign. The coverage of this year's election process was generally open and impartial, and was closely monitored by the Peruvian civic association, *Transparencia*. As a consequence, citizens were able to receive adequate accurate information upon which to make choices at the ballot box.

Election officials conducted broad voter education campaigns. National observer groups also participated widely in voter education initiatives and election monitoring activities during

⁴ The JNE is the highest electoral authority in Peru for the resolution of legal issues related to the election and for the overall supervision of the process. The ONPE actually organizes and administers the election process.

the 2001 election process. As a result of these and other factors, a high degree of public confidence was established in the government and in the election authorities. The efforts of *Transparencia* deserve particular mention in this respect. This Peruvian citizen organization conducted a broad range of activities that helped ensure the integrity of the 2001 election process, including mobilizing over 20,000 observers for both rounds of the election. These initiatives were complemented by the monitoring activities of the *Defensoria del Pueblo*, as well as other Peruvian observation groups.

As noted above, however, the pre-election period was also characterized by a general erosion of public faith in politicians, largely attributed to revelations of the so-called “vladivideos,” confirming corruption among many in government and political manipulation by the Fujimori regime. In this context, many citizens expressed disappointment in the superficial level of debate of substantive campaign issues in the media, which was often eclipsed by negative personal attacks and scandal-driven news coverage. This development was compounded by the large number of candidates and weak political party structures in Peru, which resulted in generally personalized election campaigns. An environment of public skepticism developed simultaneously and paradoxically with increased public confidence in the government and election authorities.

NDI/Carter Center deployed approximately 30 international observers to monitor the voting process in eight electoral districts in Peru on April 8, 2001. The members of the April 8 delegation noted large voter turnout, as expected, well coordinated logistical support among the various institutions involved and no exceptional problems in the voting process. The ONPE’s vote tabulation software performed well, even though there had been significant concerns about its reliability prior to April 8. The majority of polling stations experienced only minor problems such as: 1) the late opening of polling stations due to late arrival of poll workers and delays in completing opening procedures; 2) confusion among voters as to the correct voting procedure for the preferential votes for Congress and subsequent problems with the preferential vote tabulation; and 3) delays and misunderstandings related to insufficient training of pollworkers.

The final results of the first round election were: Peru Posible 36.51 percent; APRA 25.78 percent; Unidad Nacional 24.3 percent; FIM 9.85 percent; while four other political groups received less than 2 percent each. Since no candidate received more than 50 percent of the popular vote, the top two vote-getters, Alejandro Toledo and Alan Garcia, advanced to a presidential run-off election. According to the Election Law, the JNE must set the date of the run-off election within 30 days of its announcement of the official election results. For the ONPE to declare the final results, all official objections and complaints (*impugnaciones*) filed by political party representatives (*personeros*) must be resolved by the relevant *Jurado Electoral Especial* (Special Electoral Tribunal - JEE).

Although the ONPE had released more than 90 percent of the election results within three days of the April 8 elections, the final results were not released until more than one month later, due to delays in resolving *impugnaciones*. The majority of them concerned the congressional election, and many were related to mistakes by poll workers in filling out the vote tally sheets on election night. There were more than 20,000 *impugnaciones* filed nationwide, a number that is fairly consistent with previous election processes in Peru. However, it took longer than normal

for the complaints to be resolved, due in part to a lack of standardized procedures among the JEEs for processing them.

There were several important steps taken by the electoral authorities during the period between the first and second round elections to build public confidence and correct administrative delays. These measures included replacing the electoral software used in the first round with a new program; providing additional training to local election officials and pollworkers; taking measures to guarantee disabled persons full access to polling sites; and streamlining the collection process for the tally sheets to be used in the ONPE's rapid tabulation sample of results (*acopio rápido de actas*, ACRA) on election night.

The second round presidential campaign was even more intense than the first, with both candidates resorting to negative campaign tactics in attempts to win votes from an often skeptical and disinterested public. A recurring concern throughout the second round campaign was the unusually high percentage of intended blank votes reflected by polling data in the weeks leading up to the run-off election. This phenomenon was generally viewed as the product of election fatigue and general public dissatisfaction with both candidates. National and international observers urged both candidates to concentrate on generating a substantive debate on issues of interest to the Peruvian electorate, as mudslinging between the two candidates was detracting from a serious debate of campaign issues. *Transparencia* is to be commended for its efforts in organizing a televised debate between the two presidential candidates in the period leading up to the run-off election.

A delegation of approximately 30 international observers representing NDI and The Carter Center observed the voting process for the run-off election on June 3 in ten electoral districts throughout the country. Despite the tense campaign leading up to the run-off election, observers noted that the June 3 voting process went smoothly and that voters turned out in large numbers at the polls. NDI and The Carter Center were pleased to note that there were significant improvements in the logistical and operational aspects on election day as compared to the April 8 first round election. In addition, as was the case with the first round, hundreds of thousands of Peruvians helped to ensure the integrity of the election process by participating as election officials, political party pollwatchers and nonpartisan election monitors, while nearly fifteen million voters went to the polls.

Transparencia again presented the results of its nationwide, independent parallel vote tabulations or "quick count" at approximately 9:00 pm on the day of the election. This was a highly anticipated event, given the precision of its projections in the first round and in other Peruvian elections since 1995. The final results of this quick count contributed to the credibility of the electoral process, as both candidates and other political leaders immediately recognized their validity. These projections deviated by just 0.02 percent from the official results for both candidates issued by the ONPE, which confirmed public confidence in the official vote tabulation.

The results of the second round presidential election, reported at 100 percent on June 12 by the ONPE, were the following: Alejandro Toledo of *Peru Posible*, 53.08 percent; Alan García of APRA, 46.92 percent. Blank votes represented 2.75 percent and null votes 11.06 percent,

both figures being much lower than had been anticipated throughout the second round campaign. The tabulation process at the ONPE ran smoothly, in part as a result of the new software implemented for the second round and the simplified presidential ballot.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The success of the 2001 election process was truly a testament to the patience and resolve of the Peruvian people. The transitional government and the Peruvian election authorities deserve particular recognition for their outstanding dedication and demonstrated commitment to democratic principles, as well as their positive collaboration throughout a challenging election campaign.

This electoral process represents a decisive step toward re-establishing the democratic institutions and values that had been eroded by years of corruption and authoritarian government. However, the most difficult period in the consolidation of Peru's democracy is still to come. Peruvians in all sectors have recognized the need for significant constitutional, legislative and electoral reforms to ensure the accountability of elected officials in the future and to prevent the deep-seated corruption and manipulation of the political system that robbed Peruvians of much-needed national resources and undermined their faith in government.

It is particularly encouraging that the transitional government, civil society leaders, Peruvian and international legal experts and the media are promoting a broad public dialogue on the necessary reforms to be implemented by Peru's democratically elected leaders. In this sense, NDI and The Carter Center are pleased to co-sponsor with *Transparencia* and International IDEA on July 11-13, 2001, an international conference on democratization in Peru.

President Paniagua and his Cabinet should also be commended for preparing a concrete set of proposals on anti-corruption initiatives, constitutional reforms and the institutionalization of the armed forces, among other needed reforms. These proposals represent an important part of the extraordinary legacy that the transitional government leaves to the future administration of President-elect Alejandro Toledo.

After reviewing many of the recommendations made by Peruvian groups and international observers throughout the last two electoral processes, and in the spirit of continued international cooperation, NDI and The Carter Center have highlighted a number of recommended reforms for Peruvians to consider as the national dialogue process continues in the coming months.

1. Electoral and Governmental Systems and Political Processes

1.1 Broad political dialogue should be held before making changes to electoral and governance systems. Many major changes to electoral and governance systems that are essentially issues of domestic political concern are being raised in Peru. These include debate about the number of members of Congress best suited to achieve appropriate proportional representation, the appropriate division of the Congressional

seats into multi-member or single-member districts, the advantages and disadvantages of proportional, majoritarian or mixed electoral systems, as well as advantages and disadvantages of unicameral and bicameral legislatures and approaches to decentralization of governmental powers.

Long-established and transitional democracies alike have considered making changes to their electoral and governance systems to create a more sound basis for citizens to exercise their right to participate in government, directly or through electing representatives. Comparative international experience demonstrates that a broad public dialogue that includes active citizen participation and all political parties is required to reach national consensus on such changes.

Limited debate and rushed decisions often lead to the need for subsequent changes in these systems, which tends to create political instability. It is therefore recommended that decisions on whether or not to make such changes to Peru's system of elections and governance be the subject of considerable comparative study, civic education, citizen input and political dialogue.

1.2 Governmental bodies, political parties and civic organizations should encourage citizens to exercise their fundamental right to participate in governmental and political processes. Peru has suffered from a relatively long-term undermining of democratic institutions and processes. The de-institutionalization of Peru's political process obstructed avenues for citizen participation and impeded democratic development. All citizens have a fundamental right to take part in government and in public affairs of their country. Broad citizen mobilization during election periods and widespread civic participation in the political process in general are necessary to the success and sustainability of any democratic system. Government authorities, political parties, civic, religious, business and labor organizations, as well as the mass communications media, should call for a "citizenation" of the political process, encouraging citizen input to public policy formulation at the national and local levels and encouraging the public to monitor the performance and accountability of their elected representatives.

1.3 Legislation should be enacted to help strengthen political parties. Political parties are among the weakest of the necessary democratic institutions in Peru. The new Congress therefore should consider legislation to create a legal framework to help strengthen the role of political parties as democratic institutions that allow citizens to associate in order to aggregate their interests in seeking public office and enactment of public policies and creation of services to advance political, economic and social development. Such legislation should consider requirements for democratic internal party structures, promotion of women, youth and other historically underrepresented groups in political parties and the political process, as well as other key issues.

1.4 The influence of money in politics should be regulated to protect the public interest. Congress should consider comparative international approaches to public funding for political parties, electoral campaign financing and party/campaign finance

disclosure, and political party access to state-controlled mass media during and beyond electoral campaigns. Consideration should also be given to restricting paid political advertising during electoral campaigns to reduce the need for candidates to raise large amounts of money.

1.5 Party registration requirements should be reevaluated. For the 2001 elections, prospective political contestants collected approximately 6.8 million signatures, of which approximately only 1.8 million were ruled valid. Even though the law allows citizens to sign for only one party seeking qualification for a given election, RENIEC reports that many citizens sign multiple times. There are two likely reasons for this: citizens want to sign for more than one party; and/or citizens do not want to say no to party petitioners because of fear of retribution or other reasons. In addition, parties have no way of knowing whether a signer has previously signed another party's petition, and it is unfair to penalize them for collecting double signatures.

The state's interest in limiting an excessive proliferation of political parties has to be balanced against citizens' rights to express support for political pluralism and to be free from intimidation. The same applies with respect to the rights of political parties and candidates to stand for public office free from overly burdensome obstacles. Consideration therefore should be given to allowing citizens to sign petitions of more than one political party. In addition, consideration should be given to whether the number of signatures required for electoral qualification might be reduced and/or the time frame for collecting signatures might be expanded. The possibility of allowing local parties to register to participate in elections should be considered, as well as ways to achieve geographic representation of the entire country in the collection of signatures for party registration.

1.6 Consideration should be given to ways of reducing voter error and pollworker error concerning double preferential congressional voting or to alternatives to the preferential vote. In recent Peruvian elections, preferential voting procedures have generated confusion among voters, leading to relatively large numbers of null ballots and errors by pollworkers in vote tabulations. If large numbers of ballots are nullified due to voter confusion and tallysheets are incorrectly completed due to pollworker confusion, the benefits of preferential voting may be negated. Effective methods of voter education and pollworker training should be developed, or, given the magnitude and persistence of this problem, alternatives to preferential voting, such as party primaries or some number of single mandate seats, should be considered.

1.7 Steps should be taken to guarantee that all eligible voters can exercise their right to vote. As in most countries, Peru experiences a number of legal and practical restrictions on the realization of universal suffrage. Incarceration, physical disabilities, geographic remoteness and linguistic considerations all can impair the opportunity for citizens to vote. Election authorities should continue their efforts to improve access to polling stations for all citizens eligible to vote.

In Peru, military and police are legally denied the right to vote. There is no international standard on the question of voting by military and security forces, but the trend is to extend the franchise to them under conditions that ensure voting free of undue influence of military or police discipline or chain of command and with procedures that register the votes of such forces in ways that do not disturb the political will of citizens in localities where military barracks are located. It is therefore recommended that the Congress take up consideration of extending the vote to military and police forces, after studying comparative international practice and seeking citizen input.

2. Election Administration and Election Procedures

2.1 Tabulation and announcement of presidential and congressional election results should be separated. At present, official presidential and congressional election results are certified simultaneously. Considerable delay in setting the date of the presidential runoff election this year, because of this linkage, introduced an unnecessary degree of uncertainty into the election process. The delay resulted largely because of slowness in processing complaints concerning the congressional elections. The counting of votes and the tabulation of results for the Presidential election therefore should be separated from the Congressional election, in order to facilitate the vote tabulation process and allow results of the presidential election to be announced in a timely manner.

2.2 Consideration should be given to streamlining election authorities. Peru has three separate electoral authorities, the JNE, ONPE and RENIEC. Questions have been raised by Peruvian political and civic leaders concerning whether there are unneeded duplications and other inefficiencies as a consequence of this three-part structure. Congress therefore should reevaluate the current structure of the election authorities and consider possible modifications that would improve the efficiency of the electoral administration. In researching possible models, Congress and the election authorities should consider comparative international experiences, recognizing that there is no one “model” electoral system.

Models of electoral administration range from fourth branches of government with a single authority responsible for all organizational and judicial aspects of the electoral process, to divided responsibilities with a separate entity for judicial matters, such as appeal of electoral administrative decisions, and special sections within the judicial branch to enforce the criminal code. Likewise, the formulas for choosing members of national electoral bodies range from multiparty representation to professional, apolitical membership. The choices depend on the political culture and experience of each country, and indeed may change as a particular country undergoes political transition and maturation. Again, we recommend comparative study and ample civic and political dialogue before making reforms to the electoral administration of Peru.

2.3 Within the current electoral organization, consideration should be given to allowing the JNE to take decisions by simple majority vote and to allow it to investigate electoral abuses on its own initiative. The past Congress modified the Electoral Law to require the affirmative vote of four of the JNE’s five members for it to

make a decision. This was done to help prevent disqualification of Alberto Fujimori's bid for a third term of office. Reconsideration of the four-fifths supermajority requirement now seems appropriate. While there is no international standard on this issue, most election authorities act upon a simple majority vote.

In addition, consideration should be given to allowing the JNE to initiate investigations of electoral abuses without the necessity of a formal complaint (*denuncia*). This may include adding additional specialized staff and procedures for coordination with those responsible for prosecuting crimes related to the electoral process. Collection of all electoral-related offenses in one place in the criminal code and training special electoral prosecutors and judges to identify and process crimes related to electoral and political processes merit consideration as well.

2.4 Consideration should be given to increasing the number of voters per polling station. According to electoral legislation, polling stations (*mesas de votacion*) may have no more than 300 registered voters. In practice, tables rarely have more than 200 voters, resulting in approximately 89,000 polling stations in Peru. This creates a huge burden for recruiting, training and deploying election officials, political party poll watchers and nonpartisan election monitors. A principal advantage of the low number of voters is a relatively rapid count of ballots after polling has closed. It is common in other countries to have many more voters assigned to each polling station. Increasing the number of voters per polling station by two or even three times, where distances and populations allow an increase, would improve the capacities of electoral authorities, parties and candidates and citizen groups to staff the stations. While making this change, more voting centers (with fewer *mesas* in each one) could be created, so that the distance traveled for some voters can be shortened.

2.5 Electoral authorities should take further steps to ensure that polling stations open on time and that closing and reporting procedures are expedited. In the April 8 elections, a substantial number of polling stations opened significantly late. This did not appear to disenfranchise voters, but it caused confusion and seemed to diminish the prestige of the election process. The incidence of late openings appeared to diminish in the June 3 runoff, due to steps taken by the ONPE.

Further steps to ensure on-time opening of the polls should be considered. For example, requiring earlier arrival of all polling station personnel and allowing substitutes (*suplentes*) for absent pollworkers (*titulares*) from a pool of replacement poll workers or substitutes from adjoining polling stations, should they be available, could facilitate on-time openings. Procedures for opening and closing should be streamlined to save time and reduce possibilities of errors in reporting results. Tallysheets (*actas*) should be as simplified as possible, and the copy for the military eliminated.

2.6 Steps should be taken to expedite processing of electoral complaints. The JNE currently has jurisdiction for the resolution of electoral complaints (*impugnaciones*) concerning the voting, counting and tabulation of presidential results. Processing those complaints as quickly as possible, while providing requisite due process rights, is

essential for political stability, determining whether a runoff election is required, who would be in the runoff or who won in the first round. As noted above, this should be separated from certification of results for congressional elections.

The JEEs are responsible for processing *impugnaciones* concerning congressional results. The JEEs' problems in resolving complaints this year stemmed in part from a lack of uniform and clear procedures. Uniform criteria and procedures should be adopted for processing of *impugnaciones* by the JEEs. Given the sensitive nature of the work of the JEEs, consideration should also be given to allowing challenges to the appointment of members of the JEEs. This would instill confidence in the JEEs and negate the basis for charges during the complaint resolution process. In addition, when *impugnaciones* are resolved, parties and election observers should be allowed to witness the data entry and determination of final election results.

2.7 The legal minimum number of positions on congressional lists for female candidates should be respected for future elections. For the 2001 election process, the law required a minimum of 30 percent of female candidates on each congressional list. This formula was not met in the districts of La Libertad, Ica and Callao, based on a error in calculating the quota.

2.8 The cost of objecting to candidates for public office should be reduced. The fee of 3,000 soles for presenting an objection (*tacha*) to a candidate for public office is quite high. Although the money is returned if the complaint is validated, the high fee has the potential to deter citizens from filing legitimate complaints. Authorities therefore should consider reducing this fee in the future.

3. Mass Communications Media

3.1 Private media should adopt a voluntary ethical code for political news coverage. The news media are key to providing citizens with adequate, accurate information upon which to make political choices. The Peruvian press now has an opportunity to meet their responsibilities to provide accurate and balanced news coverage of political competitors (parties and political figures) and issues that affect voter choices. Professional responsibility is the key to this effort. Media outlets, as well as media and journalist associations, should consider adopting a code of conduct for responsible and impartial coverage of the political process both during and subsequent to election processes. Such associations should also consider establishing a voluntary mechanism to receive citizen complaints about abuses of such coverage and to call on media outlets to provide corrective measures on a timely basis, such as the right to reply and correction.

3.2 State-controlled media should be required to provide accurate and impartial coverage of political parties and figures. Inaccurate or politically biased information broadcast by state-controlled media had a negative effect on the political process in Peru prior to the 2001 election process. State-controlled media have a direct obligation to citizens to provide them with accurate and impartial information about governmental processes, political parties and figures and issues of political importance, so that citizens

can freely exercise their political rights. Congress therefore should consider legislation to create mechanisms that would help ensure accurate and impartial political coverage by publicly funded news media. Comparative international experience should be reviewed in a broad political dialogue about such legislation, conducted with public input.

3.3 Local news media also should be required to provide free air time and space to political contestants during election campaigns. Local news media are an important source of information upon which voters make political choices, particularly for congressional and local elections. Congress and the electoral authorities therefore should consider expanding the regulation of free air time that political parties receive during election campaigns (*franja electoral*) to cover regional and local media outlets. The appropriate authority should sanction those media outlets that do not comply with the *franja electoral*.

4. Ensuring Integrity of Public Institutions

4.1 Investigations, and where appropriate, prosecutions or administrative sanctions, should be pursued where government resources may have been used for partisan political advantage. The 2001 election process presented a fundamental improvement over the manipulation of a wide array of governmental institutions for the electoral advantage of Alberto Fujimori and his supporters during the 2000 elections. A number of isolated cases were reported by the Defensoria del Pueblo of abuse of local governmental authority for partisan political advantage in this year's election process. The Public Ministry therefore should dedicate the necessary resources to investigating municipal authorities accused of violating principles of neutrality during election campaigns, and appropriate sanctions should be sought through the courts or administrative procedures.

4.2 Government officials standing for election should be obligated to meet stringent requirements to prevent the use of state resources for electoral advantage. State resources, including the working time of all government employees, belong to the people and should be used for the public's interest - not for the electoral advantage of a candidate or political party. Individuals holding governmental office have a special public trust and responsibility to uphold this requirement. Congress and the election authorities therefore should consider enacting a range of protections to ensure that candidates cannot misuse their office, state resources or personnel in the electoral context.

For example, mechanisms for strict oversight of the inauguration of public works, government-sponsored travel, speeches made at governmental events, use of telephone services, activities of subordinates on government time and premises, and use of government vehicles should be instituted. Some countries require that all candidates for election who hold an elected or appointed position take a leave of absence from their positions during the official campaign period or from the time of registration of their candidacy.

4.3 Governmental transparency measures should be enacted to ensure the integrity of public institutions and governmental processes during and beyond elections. The key to building public confidence in government, as well as in election and political processes, is transparency. The Congress therefore should establish adequate controls and oversight mechanisms to guarantee transparency, access to information and accountability in all government programs and agencies, including the armed forces and intelligence services.

CONCLUSIONS

At this critical juncture in the consolidation of its democracy, Peru has the opportunity to take advantage of comparative international experiences and to improve on existing practices, serving as an example for the community of democratic nations. Based on the extensive experience of NDI and The Carter Center in supporting democratic transitions, the most sustainable political solutions are achieved through broad consensus-building, rather than high-level, closed negotiations. Experience also demonstrates that sustainable political solutions are best based on measures that strengthen democratic institutions, rather than personality-driven agreements, and are best taken with a long-term approach, rather than a view to “quick fixes.” NDI and The Carter Center hope that the high level of collaboration and consultation established for the successful 2001 elections will continue in the months and years to come, so that Peruvians can benefit from the political and economic stability that the country needs and deserves.

The extraordinary accomplishments of Peruvian public institutions under the leadership of President Valentin Paniagua’s transitional government, supported by the cooperative efforts of the Peruvian people, have placed Peru back on a democratic path. The clear desire of the people for political, economic and social progress and the maturity of the country’s leaders demonstrated over the 2001 election process provide a basis for confidence in the period ahead. NDI and The Carter Center have been honored to witness these events and will continue to offer support to Peruvians working for democratic development.

ANNEX 2

Taller sobre la Democratización del Estado

Organizan: International IDEA (Suecia), Instituto Nacional Demócrata, Centro Carter (Estados Unidos) y Transparencia (Perú)

Auspician: Presidencia de la República del Perú

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú

Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (Fondo Sueco de Gobernabilidad, Reforma del Estado y Sociedad Civil).

Fecha: Lima, 11, 12 y 13 de julio del 2001.

Lugar: Centro Cultural de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú
Av. Camino Real 1075 – San Isidro

Programa

Miércoles 11 de julio

16.30 Presentación del informe sobre el proceso electoral 2001 – Misión conjunta NDI – Centro Carter
Jennifer McCoy, Centro Carter
Gerardo Le Chevallier, NDI

17.30 Presentación del libro “Situación de la Democracia en el Perú (2000 – 2001)”
a cargo de los autores
Rolando Ames, Instituto de Diálogo y Propuesta
Enrique Bernales, Comisión Andina de Juristas
Sinesio López, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú
Rafael Roncagliolo, Transparencia
Con comentarios de Alfonso de los Heros, Susana Villarán y José Ugaz

CEREMONIA DE INAUGURACIÓN

19.00 *Palabras de bienvenida*
Dr. Salomón Lerner Febres
Rector Pontificia de la Universidad Católica del Perú

Saludos de las instituciones organizadoras

Gerardo Le Chevallier, NDI
Daniel Zovatto, IDEA
Alfonso Parra, BID

Salomón Lerner Ghitis, TRANSPARENCIA

Conferencia introductoria: El Perú y la Democracia en la región

Dr. Rodrigo Carazo – Ex Presidente de Costa Rica

Inauguración

Dr. Diego García Sayán

Ministro de Justicia

20:30 Vino de honor

Jueves 12 de julio

Primera Sesión

Sociedad civil y opinión pública

Moderador: Mikael Dahl, Embajador de Suecia

09.30 – 09.45	Dr. Luis Moreno Ocampo (Presidente de Poder Ciudadano - Argentina)
09.45 – 10.00	Dra. Susana Villarán, Ministra del PROMUDEH (Perú)
10.00 – 10.05	Comentarista 1: Rolando Ames, IDS
10.05 – 10.10	Comentarista 3: Sofia Macher, Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos
10.10 – 10.15	Comentarista 4: Pablo Checa, Instituto de Estudios Sindicales
10.15 – 10.40	Café
10.40 – 13.00	Debate y conclusiones

Segunda Sesión

Partidos, representación y sistema de partidos

Moderador: Daniel Zovatto, IDEA

15.00 – 15.15	Dr. Genaro Arriagada (Director del Banco de Estado, Ex - Ministro- Chile)
15.15 – 15.30	Dr. Julio Cotler, IEP (Perú)
15.30 – 15.35	Comentarista 2: Sinesio López, PUCP
15.35 – 15.40	Comentarista 3: Manuel Orozco, Diálogo Interamericano
15.40 – 15.45	Comentarista 4: Luis Solari, Perú Posible
15.45 – 15.50	Comentarista 5: Jorge del Castillo, Partido Aprista Peruano
15.50 – 18.00	Debate y conclusiones

Viernes 13 de julio

Tercera Sesión

Misión de las fuerzas armadas y sistema nacional de defensa

Moderador: Gerardo Le Chevallier, NDI

09.30 – 09.45	Gr. (R) Joaquín Cuadra (Ex –Jefe del Ejercito, Presidente de Unidad Nacional - Nicaragua)
09.45 – 10.00	Dr. Enrique Obando, Universidad del Pacífico (Perú)
10.00 – 10.05	Comentarista 1: Hugo Palma, Embajador del Perú
10.05 – 10.10	Comentarista 2: Gustavo Gorriti, Comisión de transferencia del sector Defensa*
10.10 – 10.15	Comentarista 3: Carlos Tapia, Especialista en temas militares
10.15 – 10.30	Café
10.30 – 12.30	Debate y conclusiones

Cuarta Sesión

Reformas del sistema electoral

Moderador: Charles Costello, Centro Carter

14.30 – 14.45	Mtro. José Woldenberg (Presidente del IFE - México)
14.45 – 15.00	Dr. Rafael Roncagliolo, Secretario General de Transparencia (Perú)
	Intervención de invitados especiales:
15.00 – 15.10	Dr. Manuel Sánchez Palacios – Presidente Jurado Nacional de Elecciones
15.10 – 15.20	Dr. Fernando Tuesta – Jefe Oficina Nacional de Procesos Electorales
15.20 – 15.30	Ing. Celedonio Méndez – Jefe Registro Nacional de Identificación y Estado Civil
15.30 – 16.30	Debate y conclusiones
16.30	Clausura
	Dr. Alejandro Toledo, Presidente electo*

* por confirmar

ANNEX 3

Regional workshops on electoral reform Huáncο, September 22, 2001

List of participants

NAME	INSTITUTION
1. Númītor Hidalgo	Comisi3n consultativa
2. Gregoria F3lix	Transparencia
3. Raquel Majino	NGO Micaela Bastidas
4. Carlos Jaimes	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
4. Rudy Ninaya	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
5. Neyer Garc3a	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
6. Mois3s Ramos	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
7. Roberto N3nez	Transparencia
8. Isabel D3vila	Universidad de Hu3nuco- sociolog3a
9. Antonio Franiscovich	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
10. Lisbet Rivero	Coordinadora Organizaci3n de Mujeres
11. Luc3o Flores	Universidad de Hu3nuco- dedagog3a
12. Luis Delgado	Exrector Universidad de Hu3nuco
13. Gerardo Monz3n	Unidad Nacional
14. Gladis Ramos	Asociaci3n Pro-Derechos Humanos
15. V3ctor Dom3nguez	Universidad de Hu3nuco
16. Juan Alvarado	Sec. General Per3 Posible
17. C3sar Martel	Frente C3vico
18. Alder Medrano	Juntas Vecinales
19. Roel Tarazona	Asesor, Cong. Santos Jaimes
20. Froilan Escobedo	Universidad de Hu3nuco
21. Pascual Isidro	Transparencia
22. Virgilio L3pez	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
23. Joaqu3n Garay	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
24. Andr3s Santamar3a	Comisi3n de Opini3n Huanuqueñista
25. Giovanni Fern3ndez	Municipio de Hu3nco
26. Hilda Ortiz	Asociaci3n Sociedad Civil
27. Noreña Llanos	Diario El Regional
28. Naval Aspiros	Partido Per3 Posible
29. Alfonso Victorio	Coordinador ODPE
30. Luis Lavado	Regidor Municipalidad de Ambo
31. Los3 Luis Soto	Asociaci3n Pobladores
32. Luis Aguirre	Universidad de Hu3nuco
33. Rub3n Valdez	Director, Radio Studio %
34. Ver3nica Berrospi	Transparencia
35. F3lix Roncal	Partido Aprista Peruano
36. Jhon Nalvarte	Asociaci3n Jur3dica Pro Dignidad Humana
37. Doris Ventura	Organizaci3n Sociedad Civil
38. Domingo Branchaco	Sec.General Acci3n Popular
39. Walter Bernuy	Transparencia
40. Jes3s Abad	Asoc. de J3venes ProDerechos Humanos

ANNEX 4



TALLER DE BÚSQUEDA DE CONSENSOS PARA LA REFORMA DEL SISTEMA ELECTORAL

Huánuco, 22 de setiembre del 2001

Grand Hotel Huánuco

- 9:00 a.m.** *Instalación del Taller.*
Representantes de Transparencia, NDI/Centro Carter e IDEA y anfitrión.
- 9:30 a.m.** *Introducción:*
- Presentación del documento de trabajo
- Objetivos de la reforma electoral
- Metodología del Taller.
- 10:00 a.m.** *Conferencia.*
“Objetivos y agenda de la reforma del sistema electoral”. Representantes de IDEA.
- 10:45 a.m.** *Coffee break.*
- 11:00 a.m.** *Primera sesión.*
Comisión A: Morfología del Congreso: número de congresistas, requisitos para participar en elecciones, número de cámaras, funciones de las cámaras.
Moderador: Representante del NDI/Centro Carter.

Comisión B: Circunscripciones electorales: número, tamaño, tipo (uninominal, plurinominal), tipos de lista (regionales o nacionales) y primarias.
Moderador: Representante de IDEA.
- 12:30 p.m.** *Almuerzo.*
- 2:00 p.m.** *Segunda sesión.*
Comisión A: Circunscripciones electorales: número, tamaño, tipo (uninominal, plurinominal), tipos de lista (regionales o nacionales) y primarias.

Comisión B: Morfología del Congreso: número de congresistas, requisitos para participar en elecciones, número de cámaras, funciones de las cámaras.
Moderador: Representante del NDI/Centro Carter.
- 3: 30 p.m.** *Tercera Sesión:*
Intercambio de propuestas sobre los dos temas, con participación de Congresistas invitados.
- 4:30 p.m.** *Coffee break..*
- 5: 00 p.m.** *Conclusión:* Presentación de Conclusiones del Taller (abierto al público).
Presentación: Representante de Transparencia.